INTRODUCTION

Sustainable urban development has been discussed in recent years, in Iran urban planning particularly in national frame work plan. This strategic development is more ecological which specifically indicated in terms of economic, social, spatial, cultural and environmental dimensions. Throughout this process, the purpose is to use facilities and resources more appropriate and more efficient with consideration of limitations and opportunities. In our urban society, regardless of this important approach, especially in large cities, we experience a severe loss of economic, social and cultural resources [22].

Theory of sustainable urban development suggests issues including the prevention of urban and regional environmental pollution, the reduction of local, regional and national manufacturing capacities, support for recycling and lack of support for harmful developments and to eliminate the gap between rich and poor. The sustainable urban development is a multidimensional phenomenon which takes into consideration the environment, social justice, and economic dynamism with optimum use of sources.

Creating the groundwork and establishing institutions creating sustainable development and especially good governance, the main necessities of achieving sustainable development in a general concept and sustainable urban development in a specific concept. In this context, must be redefined and supported the role of institutions and various actors including government, law, civil society, and NGOs especially the citizens and the private sector. In this regard, the characteristics of sustainable development can be outlined as follows: social equity, economic efficiency, ecological sustainability and participatory governance.

Incremental role of people in urban areas, corresponding growth of cities and towns are two marked experiences of economic and social development because urban areas through thousands urban markets functions provide significant facilities to increase welfare presenting many opportunities to people to develop a broad mix of assets and to achieve to higher efficiency of workforce and urban areas have been created due to public concerns about cultural, educational, religious considerations and mutual support issues (World Development Report, 2003).
In Iran due to delay in sustainable urban development, massive migrations to the cities and suburbs, the low level of employment and poverty in urban areas the need for environmental planning with sustainable urban development to create a groundwork for this process is very important. 

So what is important is to assess sustainable urban development in urban society and more objectively and more explicitly the impact of its social and economic factors on sustainable urban development. 

The most important purpose of this study is to assess sustainable urban development with the emphasis on socioeconomic factors in karaj District 3 (Fardis) and to present strategies and explain the model.

Research Questions: 
1) The main question: do social factors influence the sustainable urban development?

Subsidiary questions: 
- Does the life quality component influence the sustainable urban development? 
- Does the social safety component influence the sustainable urban development? 
- Does the social participation component influence the sustainable urban development? 

2) The main question: Does economic factors influence the sustainable urban development?

Subsidiary questions: 
- Does earning quality component influence the sustainable urban development? 
- Does job quality component influence the sustainable urban development? 
- Does housing satisfaction component influence the sustainable urban development? 

3) The main question: Does environmental factors influence the sustainable urban development? 

4) The main question: Does good governance factor influence the sustainable urban development?

Sustainable Development: 
Sustainable urban development is a form of development that provides sustainable development of cities and urban communities for future generations. In terms of frame work, it creates changes in land use and density levels to meet the needs of residents in housing, transportation, leisure time, etc. to keep the city, over the time, environmentally residential and livable, economically viable and socially cohesive. In other words sustainable urban development is defined as a set of terms which originates from general management and organized community that links all measures of an unsustainable city to their expected values in the nearest possible time and at a specified time interval [12].

Attention to environmental issues at the global level began after the intensification of contaminant activities in 1950s and 1960s [56]. Before 1960s attention to development subject focused more on its economic aspects [23]. In 1968 United Nations General Assembly decided to hold an international conference on environment [10].

UNESCO Biosphere Conference, Conference on Ecological Aspects of Development Conference on the Human Environment were among efforts which paid special attention to the environmental aspect of development [23]. So, after 1960s and in 1970s sustainable development was introduced [22].

Dimensions of Sustainable Development: 
Sustainable development needs to achieve simultaneously to the components or dimensions of a systematic approach and a holistic subjective perception in order to take into account every single dimension and the interactions between them. Failure to achieve any of the dimensions leads to sustainability weakness and distance from the ideal form of sustainable development.

All aspects of sustainable development including environmental, social, economic, political aspects, should be considered simultaneously and people should be encouraged to choose the best values for lives (Pak 2000, 250).

Sustainable development in a systematic relationship in a dynamic and interactive system discussed in concepts below:
- Physical- biological aspects (environmental)
- Social aspects
- Economic aspects
- Frame work aspects [10].

1) Physical-biological (environmental) aspects: 
Ecologically, development must not cause to destroy diversity and biological strength of ecosystem, and nor the ecological processes and vital systems [23]. And also leads to the integrity of the local system, sustainable and balanced productivity within the environmental capacity.
2) Economic aspect:

This aspect focuses on maintenance or improvement of the economic situation which evaluated in the whole system. Economic welfare is based on a combination of relevant economic components such as formal and informal employment, unemployment, rental rates or rent-sources, equal distribution and survival in local and global economy. Efficient management and better allocation of resources and investments will ensure this aspect.

In this aspect, more balanced urban and rural organizations and distribution of settlements and activities with an emphasis on reducing concentration in urban areas, preventing the destruction of unsustainable ecosystems, decentralized industrialization, conservation of biodiversity, new methods of cultivation and in the discussion of frame work components, availabilities, operations, and forms of constructions have been considered [10].
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Sustainable Urban Development:

Sustainability as a concept has duties to respond to the challenges facing urban areas including globalization, decentralization, and rapid growth of population. This transformations impact on factors such as economy, social conditions, and environment and cause problems such as social inequality, poor neighborhoods or informal colonies and climate change. The concept of sustainable development is to solve economic, social, environmental and governmental problems in an urban context. However, it is not available a clear definition or perception of “sustainable development” (which has more than 200 definitions). Considering the definitions of this word helps to clear up problems which the above concept should be accountable for them; however, these factors are so widely spread that getting the current concept becomes very difficult.

Saha and Paterson reviewing works of Portney, Jepson and Conroy defined four aspects for sustainable development: environmental protection, economic development, social equity and administration [40].

Numerous definitions of sustainable development have been presented. The most common definition is Brant Land Commission’s. According to the commission, sustainable development may be considered as meeting the needs of the present generation in a way that the abilities of the next generation in meeting its needs are not ruined. [31,25,5].

Sustainable development is an endogenous, systematic and balanced development that suggest a systemic vision in all disciplines, environment was the first discipline that used this concept. Sustainable development is following poverty eradication, creating balance between countries and peaceful coexistence and emphasizing peace and better use of resources especially renewable ones [18,22].

In sustainable development process, economic, financial, commercial, energy, agriculture, industry, etc. policies are adapted in such a way to sustain economic, social and environmental development. Sustainable development means not to impose economic, social, and environmental damages on future generations [30].

“Sustainable development policy implies observing the following items:
1- A political system that ensures effective participation of citizens in decision-making process.
2- An economic system that provides solutions for tensions arising from inconsistent and uneven development.
3- A productive system that respects the commitment of preserving principles of ecology.
4- A technological system that establishes sustainable patterns for commerce.
5- An international system that establishes sustainable patterns for commerce and finance.” [33].

The purpose of sustainable urban development is to create an equal balance between economic, environmental, social and governmental aspects to build cities suitable for better and more useful life in cities and villages [40].

Sustainable development means “improving life quality within the capacities of backup ecosystems” [42,22,21]. Broadly speaking, this term means the proper and efficient administration and operation of the basic natural resource, and financial and human resources to achieve a desired consumption pattern which will be
possible satisfyingly and continually by adopting technical facilities and appropriate structures and organizations to meet the needs of current and future generations [58]. Sustainable development is “a process to achieve a progressive and comprehensive approach and ongoing satisfaction through understanding the relationships between humans, humans and the environment and between components of the environment and rational intervention to improve these relationships, incorporative deployment of modern technology, indigenous knowledge, and emphasis on human rights” [49].

According to Forex “there will be no development without sustainability and no sustainability without development” [2]. sustainable development is a comprehensive approach to improving life quality to fulfill economic, social, and environmental welfare of human settlements [51]. Barton believes “sustainable development focuses on people and justice for current and future generations” [6].

Sustainable development as a process is necessary for improvement and progress; a process which is a basis for improvement and eliminates sociocultural shortcomings in advanced societies. It must be the propellent engine of balanced, proportionate and coordinated progress of economic, social and cultural situations in particularly developing countries. Sustainable development seeks to provide strategies and mechanisms to obtain important goals such as incorporation of environmental protection and development, provision of basic needs of human life, the pursuit of social justice and the eradication of poverty and general deprivation, self-determination, cultural diversity and maintaining ecological unity [45].

Sustainable development in the long term requires systematic cultural transformations which underlies democracy and social capital [46]. Sustainable development is the evolutionary state of development programs, which follows a balancing approach with a holistic view and emphasis on a systemic insight [47].

In general, a set of definitions of sustainable development presented as follows:

1- Answering the needs of future generation
2- Considering the tolerable capacity of ecosystems
3- Preserving the wealth and natural capital
4- Maintenance and upgrading systems
5- Not making worse (any positive change should not wear or destroy ecological and social systems)
6- Sustaining Human Life
7- Protecting the Environment
8- Integrating the protection and development as a general approach (satisfaction of human’s basic and social needs, achieving social justice, protecting the ecological integrity) (Azizi, 2006, 37).

In fact fundamental policies of sustainable development are divided into the following four categories:
1- To minimize the consumption of nonrenewable natural resources
2- To sustain the consumption of nonrenewable natural resources
3- To keep the limit of producing waste and pollutions in the amount of local and global absorptive capacity
4- To provide human’s basic and social needs [57].

According to the theory presented by United Nations’ environmental program (UNEP) the concept of sustainable development comprises the following aspects
1- To help the poor.
2- Considering self-development thought within the frame work of natural resources limitations.
3- Considering the effectiveness of development using economic and nontraditional characteristics
4- Considering important issues of appropriate technology, health care and housing for all.
5- Understanding the necessity of having people-oriented motivation [55].

Research Hypotheses:

Main hypothesis 1: social factors affect sustainable urban development.
1-1) Life quality variable affects sustainable urban development.
1-2) Social security component affects sustainable urban development.
1-3) Social participation component affects sustainable urban development.

Main hypotheses 2: economic factors affect sustainable urban development.
2-1) Income quality component affects sustainable urban development.
2-2) Employment quality component affects sustainable urban development.
2-3) Housing satisfaction component affects sustainable urban development. Main hypothesis 3: environmental factors affect sustainable urban development.

Main hypothesis 4: good governance factors affects sustainable urban development.

Research Theoretical Model:
Research Methodology:
Research methods used appropriately in this study include:

A) Documentary and library method: this method is used to collect material and achieve theoretical approaches and transparency of the subject in order to understand various aspects of the studied subject. Thus, in the present study the above method is used to achieve a theoretical framework, transparency of social reality and knowledge of background and research literature.

B) Survey method: Finally, this method is used to collect, classify, describe, and analyze data.

Statistical Population:
Statistical population is generalization of results and findings of the research. Statistical population contains all of the studied subjects whom the researcher selects his sample units from them. The research’s population, both analysis and observation units) are residents of district 3 in Karaj (Fardis).

Statistical Sample:
The studied sample is the citizens living in District 3 of Karaj (Fardis). The field study which conducted on the sample using direct observation. So, in the present study the individual is the unit of analysis including the citizens of District 3 of Karaj (Fardis).

Sample Size:
In this study the number and sample size of studied subjects were calculated based on Cochran formula.

\[ n = \frac{N(1-p)q}{d^2} \]

\[ n = 395 \]

\[ N (\text{statistical population size}) = 168702 \]

\[ p (\text{Probability of adjective}) = 0.5 \]

\[ q (\text{improbability of adjective}) = 0.5 \]

\[ t (\text{probability of correct speech}) = 1.96 \]

\[ d (\text{sampling error}) = 0.05 \]

Sampling Method:
Citizens residing in District 3 of Karaj (Fardis) are determined through stratified sampling proportional to size. Due to District 3 (Fardis), given neighborhoods were placed in the sample using simple random sampling. That is, at first the name of each of area on paper and then selected through draw, areas including Fardis’ Main Street, Shahrak-e Hafeziyeh, Dehkadeh, Shahrak-e Naz, Shahrak-e Pasdar, Najaf Abad, Shahrak-e Arshia. Also to take the sample among available neighborhoods through draw method, target alley were identified in each stage.

Data collection method:
In this study, the method of collecting information is based on documental and survey method. Studying the literature, backgrounds, theoretical framework, defining the concepts, the necessity of using this method were carried out by taking notes from books, articles, reports, websites and statistic documents based on documental method. Also a questionnaire was used to collect information. Each questionnaire has been designed based on research hypotheses to measure concepts and variables of the study hypotheses. In the questionnaire, indices that measure variables through questions include: (questions 1-48); social factors of sustainable urban development including life quality (questions 1-32), social security (questions 33-39), social participation (questions 40-48); (questions 49-64) economic factors of sustainable urban development including: income quality (questions 40-...
56), employment quality (questions 57-60), housing quality (questions 61-64); questions (65-69) environmental factors of sustainable urban development (questions 70-80) good governance of sustainable urban development. Questions have been designed on the basis of number 1 to 5 from very low to very high using Likert scale.

Preliminary Study of Measuring Tools:
In order to ensure the credibility or validity of the questionnaire, the questions, items and the scale used, it was referred to people who were expert in this subject matter. Also a limited population of the sample were selected and tested before confirming the questionnaire in order to eliminate probable defects. Cronbach's alpha reliability test was conducted on the scales and in the first phase the reliability of 40 samples was determined. While there was a poor reliability, it was aimed at eliminating or modifying its items to add to the reliability. The reliability was listed in the table of ultimate reliability which evaluated with 395 samples. The examination of the reliability of the measured scales indicates that all variables have an appropriate and acceptable reliability. The reliability (Cronbach's alpha) of access to services variable equals 0.88, place attachment variable equals 0.72, place quality variable equals 0.85, social security variable equals 0.77, social participation variable equals 0.84, income variable equals 0.72, employment variable equals 0.68, housing variable equals 0.73, environmental situation variable equals 0.75, good governance variable equals 0.90 and the total reliability is 0.94.

Table 1-3: The reliability of research variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Cronbach's alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>access to services</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>place attachment</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>place quality</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social security</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social participation</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>income</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>employment</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>housing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>environmental situation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good governance</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total reliability</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statistical Methods to Analyze Data and Test Hypotheses:
In this study data analyzed using SPSS 20 and LISREL. To evaluate research hypotheses, Pearson's correlation and Kendall test, Friedman test, independent t-test, multiple regression and structural equation modeling were used.

Results:
In this part examined the generalizability of obtained results to statistical society and the relationships between variables. Finally, the research model is tested.

Correlation Matrix Between Research Variables:
Table 4-18 shows correlation between all variables. Table variables include: access to services, place attachment, place quality, social security, social participation, income, employment, housing, environmental situation and good governance. Pearson correlation coefficients and significance levels are reported in the table too. Asterisk mark next to any coefficient indicates the significance of the relationship. The results show that there is almost a significant relationship between all variables. Just there is no relationship between place attachment and housing and between place attachment and environmental situation and except these two cases there is a significant relationship between other variables. As we can see in Table 4-20, there is a direct positive relationship between all variables. The strongest relationships are between income and employment status with the value of 0.68 and then place quality and good governance with a value of 0.65, and also between social participation and good governance with the value of 0.63.

Friedman Test:
Friedman test was used to prioritize (rank) variables of sustainable development. Friedman test results are given in Table 4-19. According to the results, it can be stated that considering the value for chi-square which equals 912.30 and at error level of less than 0.01 is significant, it should be stated that there is a significant difference between 10 variables of sustainable urban development, and respondents ranked differently for these 10 variables and the mean rank of respondents also varies.
Table 4-18: Correlation Matrix Between Research Variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. access to services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. place attachment</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. place quality</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. social security</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. income</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. employment</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. housing</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. environmental situation</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. good governance</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. social participation</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** correlation in error level less than 0.01
* correlation in error level less than 0.05

Results show that respondents' ranking is as follows: according to respondents the environmental situation ranked first (8.51) and has the highest mean score. Respondents have chosen the access to services variable as the second one (6.5) and has the highest score after environmental situation (in fact, in the interpretation of Friedman test about sustainable development variables, it should be stated that the highest ranking means that variable has had the most development and respondents are most satisfied with it). The next variables are as follow: the third variable, place attachment, with a mean score of 6.33, the fourth variable, life quality, with a mean score of 6.24, the fifth variable, social security, with a mean score of 6.12, the sixth variable, employment, with a mean score of 5.23, the seventh variable, housing, with a mean score of 4.45, the eight variable, income, with a mean score of 3.95, the ninth variable, good governance, with a mean of 3.86, and the last variable, social participation, with a mean score of 3.81. Good governance is in nine place indicates that this variable has not been well fulfilled in respondents’ city.

Friedman Test for Sustainable Urban Development:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of freedom</th>
<th>Significance level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi-square</td>
<td>912.301</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multi Multivariate Regression Test:

In multiple regression analysis (multivariate), the variance of the dependent variable is estimated and explained through relative contribution and linear combinations of two or more independent variables. Thus, in multiple regression analysis (multivariate) there are a dependent variable and a set of independent variables (Sai, 2009, 140).

In this section we test the simultaneous effect of sustainable urban development variables on social participation using multiple regressions test. Thus, each of sustainable development variables has an impact on people's participation in municipal affairs. Here, participation variable is the dependent variable and we are attempting to evaluate the effects of variables including access to services, place attachment, place quality, social security, income, employment, housing, environmental situation and good governance. The results are listed in Table 4-20. In this table we are reported the values of non-standardized regression coefficient (B), standardized regression coefficient (Beta), standard error (SE), significance level (P-Value) and the coefficient of determination (R2). The procedure of regression test is stepwise method.

Examining simultaneous effect of variables indicates that among given variables, good governance, income status, place attachment, employment status, and social security variables have a significant effect on social participation variable and when all nine variables entered into the regression analysis, access to services, place quality, housing status and environmental situation variables do not impact on social participation variable. In other words, multiple regression shows that in examining the effect of independent variables, we can claim 95%
(P>0.05) that good governance, income status, place attachment, employment status, and social security variables effect on social participation.

Table 4-20: Multiple regression test of sustainable urban development variables’ effect on public participation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent variable</th>
<th>Independent variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>Significance level</th>
<th>R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social participation</td>
<td>Fix value</td>
<td>0.219</td>
<td>0.084</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good governance</td>
<td>0.375</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Income status</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Place attachment</td>
<td>0.084</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employment status</td>
<td>0.114</td>
<td>0.037</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social security</td>
<td>0.074</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The values of standardized regression coefficient (Beta) related to variables are given in Table 4-20. By this coefficient, we can compare the effect and contribution of each variable on social participation. Good governance variable has the greatest impact on social participation and the beta coefficient equals 0.38. After good governance variable, income status variable has a value of 0.16. The next variables include employment status with the value of 0.15, place attachment variable with a value of 0.13, and finally, the lowest impact belongs to social security variable with a value of 0.10. As the results show all these effects are positive and direct and increasing all variables including good governance, income status, place attachment, employment status, and social security, social participation rate also increases.

According to the findings, the coefficient of determination (R2) equals 0.49 and indicates that research variables, totally, can explain 49% of changes of social participation.

Testing Hypotheses:

Main hypothesis 1: social factors affect sustainable urban development.

- Life quality variable affects sustainable urban development:
  Life quality is a function of “access to services”, “attachment place”, “place quality, a sense of optimism and hope for the future”. Based on the results the paths which relates these two elements together is positive and significant. Access to services (t=11.14), attachment place (t=13.48), place quality (t=12.19). So life quality affects sustainable urban development directly and this hypothesis is accepted.

- Social security variable affects sustainable urban development:
  Based on the results the path which relates these two elements together is positive and significant (t=8.87). So social security has a direct effect on sustainable urban development and this hypothesis is accepted.

- Public participation variable affects sustainable urban development:
  Based on the results the path which these two elements together is positive and significant (t=11.17). Therefore, public participation has a direct effect on sustainable urban development and this hypothesis is accepted.

  Main hypotheses 2: economic factors affects sustainable urban development.

1-2) Income quality variable affects sustainable urban development.
  Based on the results the path which these two elements together is positive and significant (t=12.90). So income quality has a direct effect on sustainable urban development and this hypothesis is accepted.

2-2) Employment quality variable affects sustainable urban development. Based on the results the path which relates these two elements together is positive and significant (t=8.88). So the quality of employment has a direct effect on sustainable urban development and this hypothesis is accepted.

3-2) Housing satisfaction variable affects sustainable urban development. Based on the results the path which relates these two elements together is positive and significant (t=12.81). So the quality of employment has a direct effect on sustainable urban development and this hypothesis is accepted.

Main hypothesis 3: environmental factors affect sustainable urban development. Based on the results the path which relates these two elements together is positive and significant (t=13.08). So the environmental situation has a direct effect on sustainable urban development and this hypothesis is accepted.

Main hypothesis 4: Good governance variable affects sustainable urban development.
Based on the results the path which relates these two elements together is positive and significant (t=12.41). So Good governance variable has a direct effect on sustainable urban development and the this hypothesis is accepted.

Testing the research model:
Evaluation of the first model:
In confirmatory factor analysis, the researcher is seeking to evaluate the proposed measurement model. Confirmatory factor analysis is a technique that shows how much allocation of items to hidden variables is
consistent with data collected. Confirmatory factor analysis evaluates the measurement based on being one-dimensional, reliability and validity of concepts (Brown, 2006). In Table 4-21 factor loadings, the reliability values (R²) and average variance extracted (AVE) have been reported. Factor loadings represent the correlation of each component (manifest variables) with each variable (latent). The acceptable criteria for factor loadings is 0.05. And if factor loading of an item is more than 0.05, it can be said that the item is valid. According to the results in Table 4-20, all obtained factor loadings are more than 0.5. In other words, the components are valid. Obtained factor loadings are from 0.65 to 0.83. The average variance extracted (AVE) which measures the authenticity of convergent is also more than 0.5. The factor loadings confirm that the assignment of this variable to sustainable urban development is approved.

After examining the validity of indices, researchers need to examine the reliability of used indices. The reliability of indices can be evaluated through squared multiple correlation (R²). R² values show the variance of each index which explained by the relevant latent variable (the rest of the variance is due to measurement error). The more the value of R² increases, the more reliability and validity of index will be obtained (Kalantari, 2008, 138).

Results of reliability of variables (squared multiple correlation or R²) are listed in Table 4-21. As the results show the value of R² or reliability of indices is between 0.42 and 0.69. Generally, the higher the value of R² is, the more reliable the index will be. In this study, most of the variables have acceptable reliability.

The t-value also indicates the significance level of each variable. The table shows that significance level of all variables is more than 1.96.

Table 4-21: examination of validity and reliability.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>variable</th>
<th>factors</th>
<th>variables</th>
<th>Factor loading</th>
<th>Significance level (t-value)</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>AVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable urban development</td>
<td>Social</td>
<td>Access to services</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>11.14</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Place attachment</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>13.48</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Place quality</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>12.19</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social security</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>8.87</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public participation</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>11.17</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>Income status</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>12.90</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employment status</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>8.88</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>12.81</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>Environmental situation</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>13.08</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good governance</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>12.41</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 1-4: confirmatory factor analysis model, variables of sustainable urban development.

The examination of fit indices:

If the value of normal fit index or NFI places between 0.90 and 0.95, it is acceptable and higher values than 0.95 is excellent (Houman, 2008, 41). The root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) for good models equals or is less than 0.05. The models whose RMSEA equal 0.10 or more have poor fit. Also Goodness of Fit Index (GFI), Adjusted Goodness of Fit Index (AGFI), Comparative Fit Index (CFI) and Normal Fit Index (NFI), have been listed in the Table. These indices generally are placed in the range of between zero and one.
Coefficients higher than 0.90 considered as acceptable, however, it is optional as the level, p=0.05 (Homan, 2008, 43).

Indices of model fit have been listed in Table 4-22. The value of chi-square (788.23) is significant in significance level (p-value less than 0.01). Also the values obtained are as follow: RMSEA equals 0.062, GFI equals 0.93, AGFI equals 0.92, CFI equals 0.91 and NFI equals 0.89.

Table 4-22: Indices of Model Fit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chi-square</th>
<th>P-value</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>GFI</th>
<th>AGFI</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>NFI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>788.228</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.062</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluation of the Second Model:

Factor loadings, reliability values ($R^2$) and average variance extracted (AVE) have been reported in Table 4-23. According to the results in Table 4-23, most of the obtained factor loadings are more than 0.5. In other words, the variables are valid. Obtained factor loadings are from 0.45 to 0.93. In other words, it can be said that there is a correlation between each variable and sustainable urban development. Significance level of relationships is higher than 1.96 which indicates the significance of the relation statistically.

The results show that there is a significant relationship between social, economic, environmental factors and sustainable urban development ($t>1.96$).

Table 4-23: Examining the reliability and correlation of variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>variable</th>
<th>factors</th>
<th>variables</th>
<th>Factor loading</th>
<th>Significance level (t-value)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable urban development</td>
<td>Social</td>
<td>Life quality</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>11.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Social security</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>11.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Social participation</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>12.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Social status</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>16.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Employment status</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>15.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>8.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>Income status</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>16.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Employment status</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>15.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environmental factors</td>
<td>Pollution rate</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>15.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Waste collection</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>4.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Environmental status</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>7.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good governance</td>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>10.98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Law abiding</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>12.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transparency</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>13.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good governance</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>14.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The value of correlation or factor loading of each item with each variables reported in Table 4-23. As the results show a significant level in all cases has been greater than 1.96 which indicates the significance of all the relationships and paths.
The Examination of Indices of Second Model Fit:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chi-square</th>
<th>P-value</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>GFI</th>
<th>AGFI</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>NFI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>105.16</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conclusion:

Results of main and subsidiary research hypotheses indicate a direct relationship between independent and dependent variables. In other words, social factors influence on sustainable urban development, in such a way that:

- Quality of life variable affects sustainable urban development.

  The quality of life variable is a Function of “Access to Services”, “place attachment” and “quality of place, a sense of optimism and hope towards the future”. Based on the results the path which relates these two variables together is positive and significant.

  Access to services (t=11.14), place attachment (t=13.48), space quality (t=12.19). So the quality of life has a direct effect on sustainable urban development and this hypothesis is accepted. Timmer and Seymoar (2006) have emphasized the importance of mental indicators and sociological aspects in understanding the concept of quality of life alongside environmental and objective indicators of measuring quality of life, and also sustainable development and more particularly sustainable city. For example, social sustainability (importance of social aspects) accountability and high quality of life is considered as one of the features of sustainable city.

  Another concept relating to quality of life in cities which has been highlighted is livable city model. In particular, livability refers to an urban system which helps its residents with physical, social, mental, and personal development welfare. The key principles of this matter include: equality, dignity, accessibility, friendliness, participation and empowerment. Finally, the livable city has been introduced as: a city with healthy life and easy relocation by bicycle, walking, public transportation and even car if there is no other option. The livable city is a place for all; that is, it should be attractive and valuable and provide security for all residents.

  Florida [13] in his study entitled Cities and the Creative Class reaches the conclusion that cities are mainly centers for accumulating creative human capitals and according to the theory of creative class these people choose places which are desired and proper.

  Mc Granahn and John [27], emphasizing and taking inspiration from Florida's work that people of creative class are drawn to areas that have a high level of quality of life.

  Winden et al [52] in his study entitled The Role of European Cities in Knowledge Economy, points out some of the characteristics and conditions of the urban contexts without which acquisition, creation, emission and application of knowledge is not possible. Some of these requirements include: knowledge base, industrial construction, urban desirability, quality of life, availability, variety and scale of the city.

  Bahreini and Tabiban [5] examined model of evaluation of the environment quality according to three groups including cultural requirements, basic requirements and socioeconomic requirements based on twelve indicators such as natural environment, health, safety and security, housing, economy and employment, education, urban equipment and utilities, energy, transportation, arts, heritage and recreation, and artificial environment. Kalleh’s focus on social justice in organizing the environment which leads to sustainable development has been considered as an obstacle to poverty continuations, environmental degradation and social disorder. Bahraminejad [3] in his dissertation, evaluating effective factors on quality of urban environment, has pointed to social, cultural, economic, physical factors and spatial structure and has referred to relatively improper quality of urban environment in centric texture of Shiraz.

  Rahanmai and Pourmousavi [37], examining sustainable urban development indicators, show that the metropolitan city of Tehran encountered instability in various fields as environmental, economic, social, cultural and security. Moazzen and Alizadeh Aghdam [28], examining the quality of urban life: by a model for evaluating the ranking of Iran’s provinces using cluster analysis, show that cities as Isfahan, Tehran, Yazd and Fars are among provinces which have a higher quality of urban life than other provinces.

  Rahanmaei et al. [36] in an analysis of the concept of life quality in Babolsar the score obtained for the whole city equals 8.517, that is the quality of life has an average level. It should be noted that there is a significant relationship between the level of satisfaction of citizens and their economic status.

  Pourahmad et al [34] in an analysis of classification of the quality of urban life using SAW method have stated that residents of urban neighborhood do not have a sense of satisfaction though have high standards of quality of life; in contrast, residents of poor neighborhood may be satisfied with their lives. In general, it can be said that in many cases, qualities relevant to the built environment and other life quality aspects influence on the sense of satisfaction of individuals.

  Ghalibaf et al [15] in assessing the quality of urban life (a case study: Yaftabad neighborhood) have stated that the quality of life in the region under study in the fields of environmental, social and economic has not been desired in the view of sample population, and just transportation and communications are in a medium level.
The social security variable affects sustainable urban development:

Based on the results the path which connects these two variables together is positive and significant (t=8.87). So social security has a direct effect on sustainable urban development and this hypothesis is accepted.

Kamran et al [19] with a passive defense approach in the case of District 5 of Tehran have stated about safety and security in urban spaces that security of spaces and citizens’ participation have an interactive relationship with each other. Security in urban areas helps with more participation of citizens in urban environment and therefore, citizens’ participation and social communication cause to increase security in urban spaces.

Zabetian et al [53], studying planning pattern of urban areas use affecting security of women (A Case Study: Tehran's Central Section), have stated that urban areas which have diverse uses and activities enjoy more security and also residential sectors have the highest security for women. Studies’ results have shown increasing prosperity and night life through activities and uses around the clock and monitoring them, more passerby will be present in those areas and it will promote the security.

Bayat [8], explaining sociologically the sense of security among residents of Tehran has stated that sense of insecurity varies in terms of gender, region of residence, marital status and age of the respondents. Also, there is a significant relationship between sense of insecurity and variables including crime, expectations from police, identity, trust, neighborhood attachment ans urban frame work.

Social participation variable affects sustainable urban development:

Based on the results the path which relates these two variables together is positive and significant (t=11.17). Therefore, social participation has a direct effect on sustainable urban development and this hypothesis is accepted. Luhman, Barber and Driscoll, have stated that trust and confidence is one of the key variables of level of citizens’ participation in different municipal affairs. Alizadeh Aghdam et al have studied about municipal institutions and citizens’ participation in municipal affairs. According to the results, there is a significant relationship between institutional trust and social satisfaction and social participation. In total, performance of municipal institutions has influenced on citizens’ participation in municipal affairs.

Rafieian [36], assessing the capacities of social participation in policies of intervention in ineffective urban areas, has stated that in spite of low “sense of place attachment” among residents of the area, most of the respondents (87.2%) have a tendency to participate in neighborhood activities at medium and high level.

Mohammad Pour Zarandi and Tabatabai Mozdabadi [29], examining the impact of attracting foreign and domestic investors and social participation on sustainable urban development, have reported that citizens’ participation is an inseparable component of urban development and even has a great affect on attracting investors and sustainable urban economy.

Rajabi [39] in Methods of Citizen Participation in Urban Development Processes, has stated that participation is an underlying factor involved in many other activities including activities in line with urban development.

Jomehpour [17] in his article entitled Primary Factors in Sustainable Development Process: People, Resources, Environments and the Social Participation Role, has stated that to achieve the desired development pattern or proper use of resources and opportunities and its fair distribution, social participation regarded as one of the basic and pivotal factors which contributes to integration of main elements in development process and actualization of them. Clarifying the role and status of basic elements of development, social participation has been taken into consideration as a primary factor of integrating these elements.

Economic factors influence on sustainable urban development.

Income quality variable influences on sustainable urban development:

The results show that the path which relates these two variables together is positive and significant (t=12.90). So the income quality has a direct effect on sustainable urban development and this hypothesis is accepted.

One of the effective factors on the distribution of income is indicator of financial development. Because studies show that the proper performance of financial systems can be a potential factor to increase the accumulation of physical capital, economic efficiency and thereby being long-term economic growth. Since an efficient financial system leads to direction of additional capital to its best use (Batuo et al, 2010, 1).

Employment quality affects sustainable urban development:

Based on the results, the path which relates these two variables together is positive and significant (t=8.88). So the quality of employment has a direct effect on sustainable urban development and the hypothesis is accepted.

Labor force is one of the most important factors of production which plays a major role in production through participation in production both physically and intellectually. Also employment is important from the perspective of development. [41].
Razavi & Moslehi [41] in dynamic analysis of employment in Iran economy have stated that per 2.5% economic growth, unemployment rate 2.8% decreases, which indicates the great impact of economic growth on increasing employment in the country.

Ziyari [57] in a study analyzed the employment planning in Yazd and has concluded that the most important sectors of employment creation, financial and business. For every job created in business and financial sectors 7.1 jobs and in manufacturing and services industry respectively 3.1 and 3 jobs have been created in Yazd province.

Ghaffari et al [14] in a study analyzed the space of economic structure of employment in Chahar Mahal and Bakhtiari province and concluded that the employment in this province tends to services and as it continues we will face with a growth in services sector and in the line with it decrease in growth of other economic sectors during future decades in all parts of this province; generally, it can be said that appropriate understanding of the environment leads to purposeful programs based on ecological capacity of each area and we can expect a sustainable development in various parts of economy in the province.

_Housing quality variable affects sustainable urban development:_

Based on the results, the path which relates these two variables together is positive and significant (t=12.81). Therefore, housing quality has a direct effect on sustainable urban development and this hypothesis is acceptable.

Basically, housing quality depends on the physical and social situations of surrounding area where the house is located in. There is a strong relationship between housing and general development. Construction, development and sale of house create employment, income and income tax; real estate has always been a key part of the urban economy.

Hekmat Nia and Ansari [16], in an article entitled Housing Planning in Meibod: a Sustainable Development Approach, have shown that housing construction in Meibod has developed specially during 1995-2005 and after approval and implementation of comprehensive and detailed plans, fortunately in this decade, it has had a relatively suitable progress in terms of quality and quantity, then it can be said that there has been a significant relationship between the city and sustainable urban development.

Maliene and Mayls [24] in their study entitled Quality Housing: a Key to reach Sustainable Communities, have focused on characteristics of the quality housing and its role in attractiveness and health of communities. In this study, housing is regarded as a key tool in creating sustainable communities.

Zamani et al [54] in a research entitled Analysis of Housing Development in the Old Context of Kordabad in Isfahan: A Sustainable Development Approach have shown that improvement of financial power of households, standardization of houses, organization of applications and increase of the municipality supervision on housing development are of the most efficient strategies to achieve sustainable housing development in Kordabad.

_Environmental factors affect sustainable urban development:_

Based on the results, the path which relates these two variables together is positive and significant (t=13.08). Therefore, environmental factors have a direct effect on sustainable urban development and this hypothesis is accepted.

The project of Green City which has been raised by Green City conference took place in October 1999 by the Environmental Protection Agency. The main objectives of this project include solving environmental disorders and improving living conditions through increasing public awareness, creating unity among people and governmental agencies, institutionalizing the role of NGOs in order to use facilities and available resources and as a result creation of a green and unpolluted environment [11].

_Good governance variable affects sustainable urban development:_

Based on the results, the path which relates these two variables together is positive and significant (t=12.41). Therefore, Good governance has a direct effect on sustainable urban development and this hypothesis is accepted.

Urban good governance is defined as a collaborative process whereby all beneficiaries including the government, private sector and civil society provide means for solving urban problems. In this model, the direct executive responsibility for urban management decreased and more possibilities have been provided for bottom up planning and control by private and public institutions. Here urban management is not top down and citizen participation in administration of municipal affairs is inseparable [26].

Sharma [48] identifies institutional deficiencies as characteristic of many less developed and developing countries. Since poor governance and also inadequate controlling, regulatory and legal framework have deprived these countries of productive investment needed for economic growth and development. He believes that democracy and transparency, economic growth and development significantly influence on the society, and in
particular, assurance of private property rights and institutionalizing the law governance encourage strong incentives for innovative people and protect citizens against deceptions.

Dellepiane Avellaneda supports the growing importance of good governance for development. In this study focused on inner and distributive nature of entities and mutual and interconnected impacts of entities and the economic and social performance which are the requirements to move from limited development approach (improvement of economic growth) to broader concepts of comprehensive governance and development (democracy, equality, justice and social welfare).

Omidi [32] in his article entitled, Good Governance and Efficient Management of areas in Iran, states that the most important indicator of good governance is government accountability, relative justice in allocation of values and the attempt to decrease the gap between center and around. Governments, according to their historical changes, choose different formulas to administer their vast and diverse environment. All are common in this principal that good governance requires more accountability and effectiveness of policies. People living in the peripheral areas of a country consider playing role in power and determination of their destiny as one of the most powerful mechanisms to avoid inequality. In Iran, the best model for administration the country and realization of goals of good governance, is decentralization. Decentralization closes managers’ decisions public demands.

Suggestions:
According to the results of this research, some suggestions are presented regarding the assessment of sustainable urban development in District 3 of Karaj (Fardis).
Preparation of research projects in theoretical fundamental and applied levels by relevant institutions and executive agencies such as municipalities in order to assess sustainable urban development from social, economic, cultural, physical, and administrative aspects.

To identify the strengths and weaknesses of cities, it should be dedicated adequate budget to researches in strength and weakness points, opportunities and threats (SWOT) focused on sustainable urban development in Iran by relevant ministry to remove barriers and enhance the capabilities.

In Iran, assessment of sustainable development in low levels of environmental organization of cities (urban areas and neighborhoods) should be better tend to economic and social dimensions.

As Karaj has not a rich statistical information, it should be required to be provided comprehensive statistical data about Karaj and its urban areas by statistical center. -Need to sustainable economic and social development and considering stability rich culture of sustainability in the city.

Iran still has not managed to compile the national agenda 21 and the program for the un-sustained development and the discussion is unfamiliar in the community and even at the universities. Universities are recommended to provide appropriate contexts for addressing the sustainable urban development and sustainable development in various scientific disciplines.

Sustainable urban development should be considered by educational systems from primary to university courses and should be taught to individuals that what are rights, individual and social responsibilities in this context?

Considering Islamic values for culture of sustainable urban development.
Carrying out researches about sustainable urban development is a national necessity.

People’s broad needs and cultural and social characteristics and religious and political factors of Iran’s culture and civilization must be proper, accurate and efficient to adapt cities and urban environments to the social needs and demands in order to improve “quality of life” and increase “social capital” in urban structures.
Each Iranian city due to its geographical conditions and historical circumstances and local factors can fulfil its local residents’ needs.

Cities must enable their residents to use their advantages that is provide facilities, services and welfare to residents, also there should be places to present equal use to all social classes, particularly vulnerable (women, children, social sectors, especially in socially vulnerable groups (women, children, the handicaps and the elderly). Meanwhile, it is necessary to consider the rights of future generations to enjoy the natural resources and environment, and to grant cultural, historical and environmental heritage to the committed future generations in the context of “sustainable development”.

Considering the quality of life plays a role in residents and owners’ participation, officials may begin from neighborhoods in where people, having a good quality of life, participate more and introduce it as a good example for gradual participation in other neighborhoods.

Assigning responsibility to the young and adolescents due to spatial and environmental conditions (demography) to prepare and strengthen their confidence and self-esteem. Creating sensitivity and responsibility in young people towards preservation of the environment and natural resources.

Emphasizing all members participation and relying on teamwork practices in planning methods of the young.
The adaptation of a common inclusive strategy is necessary to promote quality and quantity of men and women participation with consultation, assistance and alignment with all ethnic groups and classes.

Historical and geographical situation of Iran, constant invasion of aliens and the destruction of civil life and the rise of autocracies, lack of social, financial, and life security, etc. have caused structural and intellectual barriers which impede the growth of public participation. Therefore, people have a long way to overcome the barriers of involvement and overall development. Understanding this barriers and proper and adequate use of historical trade and its own and other countries of the world’s achievements will accelerate traversing this path.

Municipal officials in relation with people, must act honestly and people must have no doubt in their transparency, in this case, people tend to take part in municipal affairs more than ever.

It seems one of the most important institutions is municipal council that can be considered significant and dynamic alongside other important social institutions and can make it possible to reduce social problems. Municipal council’s performance is very effective for citizens participation in municipal affairs. Therefore, this entity should revise its performance more than ever.

The other entity is municipality. Municipality is among entities which may be usually regarded as the reason for development or underdevelopment of the city by citizens. If municipality’s officials demand decisive involvement of their citizens in municipal affairs must be sensitive in providing urban services to the citizens and be transparent towards expenses, revenues, etc.

Holding public meetings in order to gather informal comments of citizens, meetings, gatherings and seminars to benefit from citizens’ point of views to regulate Regulations.

Considering necessary credits especially by municipalities to improve citizens education scientifically and academically, to install panels in various parts of the city, providing informative catalogs and brochures, etc.

The issue of urban areas’ security must be regarded in micro urban projects. In this case, municipalities can widen the street, build pedestrian bridges and provide good lighting to reduce this problem. Traffic police can also be effective in making the city safe by fining violators, using the other countries’ experiences and applying modern technologies for monitoring the streets.

For solving security problems in the streets of District 3 of Karaj (Fardis), municipality can identify locations with poor lighting and provide light resources for them, repair damaged resources, and simply reduce and remove the most major factor of insecurity in this area from the citizens perspective.

Ensuring the security at recreation centers, police force can reduce the presence of thugs and riots using patrols and installation of surveillance cameras.

Measures for increasing access to emergency including increasing public phones, lighting and equip them with code and button of emergency.
-Providing services as local access.
-Increasing green environments in neighborhoods and quick access to them.
-Creating amusement parks and special places for leisure time.
-Improving income and job security as an important factor in quality of life.
-Creating jobs, reducing unemployment, giving employment loans.
-Providing housing facilities and monitoring housing construction.
-Transparency of policies, laws and regulations in construction and development projects.
-Helping private sectors in the implementation of municipal affairs.
-Creating an appropriate ground for close cooperation among citizens, municipality and local government.
-Structural changes in administrative system and decentralization.
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